

Claims 1, 6, and 9 have been amended to clarify the Applicant's claimed invention. As discussed in greater detail in the accompanying remarks, the cited art does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. Therefore, Claims 1-16 should be allowable over the cited art.

Brief Discussion of Amendments

Independent Claims 1, 6, and 9 have been amended to clarify that the claimed invention is adapted to send, receive, or formulate a SMS message, wherein the message includes status-type information. All of the proposed amendments to the claims are fully supported by the original specification.

Furthermore, the Abstract has been amended in accordance. No new matter has been introduced into the specification.

Brief Discussion of the Cited Art

U.S. Patent No. 5,878,351 to *Alanara et al.* describes a method and apparatus for operating a cellular communication system with short messaging system (SMS) capability. While *Alanara et al.* generally describes the steps for transmitting a point-to-point message such as a SMS message via a digital cellular system, *Alanara et al.* does not specifically disclose or suggest coupling a communication device to a dispatch computer, wherein the communication device is adapted to send and receive messages in a SMS format.

Furthermore, *Alanara et al.* does not specifically disclose or suggest a SMS message including status-type information.

U.S. Patent No. 5,533,093 to *Horton et al.* describes a system that analyzes fault information and suggests a problem solving strategy. In *Horton et al.*, fault information originates from a subscriber call to a service center, where a trouble ticket is generated. In response to a trouble ticket, a repair technician or craftsperson is sent to a specified location to determine a cause for the fault. Based upon fault information transmitted by the repair technician or craftsperson, *Horton et al.* utilizes a set of complex rules with a knowledge and shared information database to analyze the fault information, and to derive a proposed solution for the cause of a fault. Communications between the system and the repair technician or craftsperson are implemented through “wireless” or “wireline communications sub-subsystems.” That is, the craftsperson’s computer unit is interfaced with a communication and signal processing subsystem on board the technician’s service vehicle. However, *Horton et al.* does not specifically disclose or suggest coupling a communication device to a dispatch computer, wherein the communication device is adapted to send and receive messages in a SMS format. Furthermore, *Horton et al.* does not specifically disclose or suggest a SMS message including status-type information.

U.S. Patent No. 5,719,918 to *Serbetciouglu et al.* describes a transaction handling system for use in cellular telephone network utilizing SMS capability. *Serbetciouglu et al.* relates to encrypting digitally coded information for a short messaging system, and then decrypting the short messaging system message. While *Serbetciouglu et al.* generally

discusses transmitting messages in SMS, *Serbetcioglu et al.* does not specifically disclose or suggest coupling a communication device to a dispatch computer, wherein the communication device is adapted to send and receive messages in a SMS format. Furthermore, *Serbetcioglu et al.* does not specifically disclose or suggest a SMS message including status-type information.

II. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable. Specifically, Claims 1-3, 6-8, 9, and 12-16 were rejected over U.S. Patent No. 5,878,351 to *Alanara et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,533,093 to *Horton et al.*, and further in view of 5,719,918 to *Serbetcioglu et al.* Office Action, p. 3, paragraph 5. The remaining claims were rejected over these references and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,737,728 to *Sisley et al.*, and U.S. Patent No. 5,729,537 to *Billstrom*. Independent Claims 1, 6, and 9 have been amended to clarify the invention. In light of the present claim amendments and remarks below, the rejections of Claims 1-16 are respectfully traversed.

The Rejection of Independent Claim 1

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the claimed invention is a “method for dispatching work orders and receiving status information concerning such orders via communications network adapted to communicate short message service (“SMS”) messages” including the amended element “coupling a communication device to a dispatch computer, wherein the communication device is adapted to send and receive messages in a

SMS format, and wherein the message includes status-type information." (Underlining supplied). The Office Action admits that *Alanara et al.* does not teach "dispatching orders and receiving status information regarding the orders, users with communication devices remotely located, coupling a communication device to a computer, coupling short message center to a mobile switching center, providing a user with a processor and a transceiver, or causing a processor to periodically process a short message." p. 4, lines 6-10. Thus, *Alanara et al.* does not disclose or teach the element "coupling a communication device to a dispatch computer, wherein the communication device is adapted to send and receive messages in a SMS format, and wherein the message includes status-type information." (Underlining supplied).

Furthermore, *Horton et al.* does not disclose this element. In contrast, *Horton et al.* describes a system that analyzes fault information and suggests a problem solving strategy. According to *Horton et al.*, "operative to analyze multiple sources of information, including user inputs from the craftsperson, parametric data embedded in the dispatch (trouble ticket), test data obtained through the execution of local tests, and remote test data (obtained through a system such as mechanized loop testing (MLT) system), and to derive therefrom a troubleshooting strategy that will enable the craftsperson to expeditiously determine the cause of the problem that gave rise to the generation of the trouble ticket." Col. 3, lines 52-60 (Underlining supplied). While *Horton et al.* discloses this troubleshooting mechanism in a wireless context, the purposes of *Horton et al.*, are altogether different than those of the Applicant's claimed invention, which is to send and receive short messages with status-type

information. *Horton et al.*, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest “coupling a communication device to a dispatch computer, wherein the communication device is adapted to send and receive messages in a SMS format, and wherein the message includes status-type information.” (Underlining supplied).

Moreover, *Serbetciouglu et al.* relates to encrypting digitally coded information for a short messaging system, and then decrypting the short messaging system message. While *Serbetciouglu et al.* generally discusses transmitting messages in SMS, *Serbetciouglu et al.* does not specifically disclose or suggest coupling a communication device to a dispatch computer, wherein the communication device is adapted to send and receive messages in a SMS format. Furthermore, *Serbetciouglu et al.* does not specifically disclose or suggest a SMS message including status-type information.

For at least the following reasons, the disclosures of *Alanara et al.*, *Horton et al.* and *Serbetciouglu et al.* cannot be combined in the manner suggested by the Office Action. First, *Alanara et al.* and *Serbetciouglu et al.* generally relate to sending SMS messages, but do not suggest a format or formulation for status-type information. Next, *Horton et al.* is only concerned with generating a solution from fault information, and does not relate to status-type information. These distinctions show that there is a fundamental difference between the functional operations of the disclosures, and they cannot be combined in the manner shown.

As demonstrated above, all of the elements of amended Claim 1 are not disclosed or taught by the cited references, thus amended Claim 1 should be patentable over the cited art.

The Rejection of Dependent Claims 2-3

Dependent Claims 2 and 3 are ultimately dependent from amended independent Claim 1. Arguments for patentability of amended Claim 1 have been advanced above. If the underlying amended independent Claim 1 is found to be patentable over the cited references, then dependent Claims 2 and 3 should also be patentable over the cited references.

The Rejection of Independent Claim 6

Independent Claim 6 has been amended to clarify that the claimed invention includes “periodically causing the central processor to formulate a short message to a selected service technician processor that provides that service technician a dispatch order, wherein the short message includes status-type information.” (Underlining supplied). Similar to the arguments advanced above with respect to amended Claim 1, neither *Alanara et al.*, *Horton et al.*, or *Serbetciouglu et al.* teach or suggest formulating a short message with status-type information in a dispatch order. Furthermore, as previously advanced with respect to Claim 1, the cited references cannot be combined in the manner suggested by the Office Action.

Since the above limitations are neither disclosed or taught by *Alanara et al.*, *Horton et al.*, or *Serbetciouglu et al.*, amended independent Claim 6 should be patentable over the cited art.

The Rejection of Dependent Claims 7-8

Dependent Claims 7 and 8 are ultimately dependent from independent Claim 6. Arguments for patentability of amended independent Claim 6 have been advanced above. If the underlying amended independent Claim 6 is found to be patentable over the cited references, then dependent Claims 7 and 8 should also be patentable over the cited references.

The Rejection of Independent Claim 9

Independent Claim 9 has been amended to clarify that the claimed invention includes “formulating at a central processor a message to at least one of the service technicians for wireless transmission according to a preselected format, wherein the message includes status-type information.” (Underlining supplied). Similar to the arguments advanced above with respect to Claims 1 and 6, neither *Alanara et al.*, *Horton et al.*, or *Serbetciouglu et al.* teach or suggest formulating a short message with status-type information in a dispatch order. Furthermore, as previously advanced with respect to Claims 1 and 6, the cited references cannot be combined in the manner suggested by the Office Action.

Since the above limitations are neither disclosed or taught by *Alanara et al.*, *Horton et al.*, or *Serbetciouglu et al.*, amended independent Claim 9 should be patentable over the cited art.

The Rejection of Dependent Claims 12-16

Dependent Claims 12-16 are ultimately dependent from independent Claim 9. Arguments for patentability of amended independent Claim 9 have been advanced above. If the underlying amended independent Claim 9 is found to be patentable over the cited references, then dependent Claims 12-16 should also be patentable over the cited references.

The Rejection of Dependent Claims 4-5

Dependent Claims 4 and 5 are ultimately dependent from independent Claim 1. Arguments for patentability of amended independent Claim 1 have been advanced above. If the underlying amended independent Claim 1 is found to be patentable over the cited references, then dependent Claims 4 and 5 should also be patentable over the cited references.

The Rejection of Dependent Claims 10-11

Dependent Claims 10 and 11 are ultimately dependent from independent Claim 6. Arguments for patentability of amended independent Claim 6 have been advanced above. If the underlying amended independent Claim 6 is found to be patentable over the cited references, then dependent Claims 10 and 11 should also be patentable over the cited references.

III. OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION

Missing Abstract

The Applicants' originally filed specification contained an abstract on a separate page. A copy of the Abstract as originally filed is enclosed with this response, entitled "ABSTRACT". The enclosed page was filed with the original specification and mailed to the U.S. Receiving Office on July 6, 1999.

Drawings

The Examiner's objections to the drawings from paragraph 2, page 2 of the Office Action are noted. Substitute drawing pages have been enclosed for FIGs. 3-8, and the Specification has been corrected in accordance with the Office Action recommendations.

Specifically, the Specification has been corrected to reference the "Send" button, now denoted as 302 in substitute FIG. 3. Further, the Specification has been corrected to reference the "Create New Ticket" button 220. In substitute FIG. 4, reference numeral 409 has now been omitted. In substitute FIG. 5, reference numerals 501 have been corrected to designate steps 501a, 501b, and 501c, respectively. Further, reference numerals 503 have been corrected to designate steps 503a and 503b, respectively. In substitute FIG. 6, reference numerals 604 have been corrected to designate steps 604a, 604b, and 604c, respectively.

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

AMENDMENTS IN THE CLAIMS

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.121(c), the following versions of the claims as rewritten by the foregoing amendment show all the changes made relative to the previous versions of the claims.

1. (Amended) A method for dispatching work orders and receiving status information concerning such orders via a communications network adapted to communicate short message service (“SMS”) messages, the method comprising:

(a) coupling a communication device to a dispatch computer, wherein the communication device is adapted to send and receive messages in a SMS format[:], and wherein the message includes status-type information;

(b) formatting a dispatch order into at least one SMS message; and

(c) forwarding the SMS message over the communications network to a selected communication device or a group of communication devices.

6. (Amended) A method for dispatching orders to service technicians remotely and receiving responsive information from such technicians concerning the orders via at least one wireless network adapted to transmit short messaging service (“SMS”) messages to allow communication among a central processor and service technicians without making a wireless telephone call, the method comprising:

(a) providing each service technician with a processor and a transceiver adapted to communicate via SMS messages;

(b) periodically causing the central processor to formulate a short message to a selected service technician processor that provides that service technician a dispatch order, wherein the short message includes status-type information;

(c) transmitting the message over the wireless network via a short messaging center coupled to a mobile switching center within the wireless network; and

(d) receiving the message at the selected service technician's transceiver.

9. (Amended) A method for managing dispatch applications in order to deliver messages from or to each of multiple service technicians deployed over a geographically-dispersed area, the method comprising:

(a) formulating at a central processor a message to at least one of the service technicians for wireless transmission according to a preselected format, wherein the message contains status-type information;

(b) transmitting the message to a network element for identifying that message; and

(c) transferring the message from the network element to a communication device associated with the selected service technician, wherein the communication device is adapted to cause the message to be displayed to the service technician and is capable of forwarding from the service technician a reply message concerning the status of a dispatch order.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 6, and 9 are independent claims. Claims 1, 6, and 9 have been amended by the present amendment. The cited art does not teach or suggest the claimed invention recited by Claims 1-16 pending in the application. Therefore, these claims should be allowable over the cited art. The Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney of record at (404) 815-6048 if such contact will facilitate an efficient examination and allowance of the application. If any additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 11-0855.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher J. Chan
Reg. No. 44,070
Attorney for Assignee

DATED: **NOVEMBER 21, 2002**

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street
Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
(404) 815-6500
(404) 815-6555 (fax)
Attorney Docket No.: 36968/191614
Reference No.: 36968/191614
BS No. 98014